

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0167968 A1) in view of Allison (U.S. Patent No. 6,819,932). Claim 9 is further rejected as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Wilson teaches, when a spam message is first received by a mail device 100, that a user reads the message and determines whether it is spam. If the message is determined to be spam, a signature is sent to a spam-blocking server 102. When another mail device 106 receives the same message, before it is displayed to the user, spam-blocking client software 110 generates and sends one or more signatures to the spam-blocking server. The spam-blocking server then generates information which helps the mail device 106 determine whether the message is spam. This process of receiving a message as disclosed by Wilson is more clearly illustrated with reference to FIGs. 2 and 3, in which a message is received (Step 200) and then distinguishing properties are identified (Step 202). In other words, Wilson does not teach or suggest determining if a spam blocking option is set, and if the spam blocking option is set, accessing a spam-blocking information database.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled without prejudice. Withdrawal of the rejection of said claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is cancelled without prejudice; therefore the enablement rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 3 has been amended to recite the novel feature “ providing for the registered SMS message phone number to be one of blocked and deleted, and allowing a subscriber

to send a warning message," which is neither disclosed, taught or fairly suggested by Wilson alone or in combination with Allison.

Accordingly, as neither Wilson nor Allison teaches each and every limitation of Claim 3, and Allison does not cure the deficiencies of Wilson, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 3 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4-7, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on independent Claim 3. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 4-7 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 3-7, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 702  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/EC